REMARKS

Claims 1-14, as amended, remain herein.

Applicants appreciate the statements in the Office Action that claim 9 is allowed and that claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the independent claim from which it depends. As explained herein, applicants believe that all claims 1-14 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

said setting parameters for modifying during a setting operation a visual aspect of the line of at least one portion of a curve representative of a parameter whose setting is being adjusted

See the specification at page 6, lines 15-17, describing adjusting a portion of the curve to be thicker than the rest of the curve, and the discussion below, herein.

1. Claims 1, 10, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), Fig. 1 and Oravetz et al. U.S. Patent 5,872,722.

The presently claimed man-machine interface for an electronic trip device comprises a man-machine interface connected to a processing unit for supplying setting-parameters, each having a representative value, the setting-parameters for modifying during a setting operation a visual aspect of the line of at least one portion of a curve representative of a parameter whose setting is being adjusted, that is, for modifying the appearance of at least one portion of a curve line, so that such portion is readily distinct from other portions of the curve. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in either of the cited references.

The Office Action cites Applicants' Admitted Prior Art described in the specification, (AAPA), Fig. 1, as allegedly disclosing a processing unit for supplying setting-parameters to a man-machine interface. However, the Office Action admits that the AAPA does not disclose means for displaying the setting-

parameters in a man-machine interface for modifying a visual aspect of at least one portion of a curve representative of a parameter whose setting is being adjusted, and cites Oravetz '722 as allegedly teaching same.

Actually, Oravetz '722 does <u>not</u> teach changing the visual aspect of a curve line, itself. Applicants' use of the term "visual aspect" is fully described throughout the specification in terms of various graphic options for applying visual emphasis to at least a portion of a displayed curve line that is under consideration by the user for parameter adjustment during real-time operation. A portion of a curve line of interest is graphically enhanced, i.e., its visual aspect is modified, during the steps taken to undertake parameter adjustment, thereby limiting the tendency to make an adjustment that affects the wrong portion of the curve, with potentially catastrophic consequences.

Contrary to the above, Oravetz '722 teaches direct manipulation of trip curves of a circuit breaker without any change in the visual aspect of at least a portion of the curve,

during real-time adjustment of the parameters. No change is made to the visual aspect of the specific portion of the curve being adjusted, and therefore, no additional safety is provided by the system. In Oravetz '722, a user can manipulate a segment of a curve to change the value of the setting, and/or the coordination of the trip curve of an intermediate device, between the boundary curves of a lowest device and a highest In this manner, the entire curves can change their device. positions and margins, but portions of the lines of the curves themselves do not change in their visual aspect. The Oravetz '722 system does not allow modification of the visual aspect of a portion of a curve line representative of a parameter whose setting is being adjusted, as recited in applicants' claim 1. That is, the Oravetz '722 system does not allow modification of the appearance of the line of at least one portion of a curve, so that such portion is readily distinct from other portions of the curve.

Also, the AAPA does <u>not</u> disclose modifying a visual aspect of a curve line during a setting operation, as recited by

applicants' claim 1. In other words, neither the AAPA nor Oravetz '722 describes a real-time change in the visual aspect of a portion of a curve line representing parameters of an actual circuit in which the trip device is actively operating, while the setting-parameters for the highlighted portion of the curve line is being changed, as recited in applicants' claim 1. That is, neither system permits modifying the appearance of the line of at least one portion of a curve, so that such portion is readily distinct from other portions of the curve.

For the foregoing reasons, neither the AAPA nor Oravetz '722 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references which would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 10, 12 and 14, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 3-8, 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) over AAPA, Fig. 1, Oravetz '722 and Alexander et al. U.S. Patent 6,038,516.

Claims 3-8, 11 and 13, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

The Office Action admits that the AAPA does not disclose changing the background of an item of information, framing of a selected item, highlighting information in a scrollable menu, or screen representation of function buttons, and that neither AAPA, Fig. 1, nor Oravetz '722 discloses a communication means for communicating according to an internet type protocol, and cites Alexander '516 as allegedly disclosing same. However, Alexander '616 does not provide the deficiencies of AAPA, Fig. 1, and Oravetz '722, described herein.

All claims 1-14 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1-14 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

September 30, 2003

Date

Roger W. Parkhurst

Registration No. 25,177

Robert N. Wieland

Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: MGRN:376

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P. 1421 Prince Street, Suite 210

Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805

Telephone: (703) 739-0220

PLEASE ACCEPT THIS AS AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT OR CREDIT FEES TO DEP. ACCT. 16-0331 PARKHURST & WENDEL